DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 492 CE 006 163

AUTHOR Peterson, Don; And Others
TITLE [Arizona] Field Test Report. Vol. 5. Yearnings and Earnings. 1974-75.
INSTITUTION Mesa Public Schools, Ariz. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Arizona State Dept. of Education, Phoenix.
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 44p.; For related documents, see CE 006 159-170; For the unit evaluated, see CE 004 718

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Career Awareness; *Career Education; Community Planning; *Community Services; *Curriculum Evaluation; Elementary Education; Evaluation Methods; Grade 4; *Money Management; *Program Attitudes; Questionnaires; Tables (Data); Unit Plan
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; *Field Testing

ABSTRACT

The field test report on the "Yearnings and Earnings" instructional unit for grade 4 is one of a series of reports on the Arizona developed Career Education Curriculum Units. Presented is specific information as to the success of the units in terms of the learner's cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behavior according to expressed performance and behavioral objectives. Cognitive and student and teacher attitudinal data were collected from five sites and projects in Arizona. Following the introduction, a brief description of the unit is given. The body of the document presents and discusses various tables showing field test results in the following areas: (1) information describing the field test, including demographic characteristics of both participating teachers and learners, (2) attitudinal data from both teachers and learners concerning the unit, (3) learner performance data on the lessons' specific items, and (4) teacher recruitment, refinement data, analysis, and comments. Four brief conclusions and recommendations are included. The document concludes with two appendixes: statistics and tabular data on student and teacher attitudes and a sample of the field test instrument package--UNIVAL (forms and questionnaires on student and teacher attitudes and student performance). (Author/BP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED117492

ARIZONA RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
1535 WEST JEFFERSON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIELD TEST REPORT
Vol. 5

YEARNINGS AND EARNINGS

Don Peterson
Frank L. Vicino
Charles Small
James S. DeGracie

ONE OF A SERIES IN THE
ARIZONA STATEWIDE FIELD TEST 1974-75

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Conducted by
THE DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Mesa Public Schools

Dr. George N. Smith
Superintendent

Dr. James K. Zaharis
Assistant Superintendent
Educational Services

for
THE ARIZONA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Carolyn Warner, Superintendent
Arizona Department of Education

Eugene L. Dorr
Associate Superintendent for
Career Education

CE 006 163


Coconino
Yavapai
WACOP
Roosevelt
Central Maricopa
Mesa
Pinal
Tri-
County
Pima

FOREWORD

So many have contributed major input to the field test processes of unit delivery, monitoring and instrument completion, that it is impossible to extract, note, and applaud individual efforts. I am sure that all those involved in this major team effort can see how much has been accomplished and have a positive view of its educational significance for the young people of Arizona. By documenting and analyzing the capabilities of the career education units tested, we all have contributed a positive boost to career education in school districts across the state.

The task of Field Test Manager has been simplified considerably by excellent staff support from the Mesa Public Schools Department of Research and Evaluation, responsive assistance from the State Department of Education, and the effective management shown by the field test coordinators from the respective field test projects.



Frank Leo Vicino
Field Test Manager

June, 1975

STATEWIDE FIELD TEST TASK FORCE

State Department of Education
Dr. Beverly Wheeler, Director, Research Coordinating Unit

Mesa Public Schools, Department of Research and Evaluation
Frank Leo Vicino, Director, Evaluation
Dr. James S. DeGracie, Director, Research
Don Peterson, Research Associate
Charles Small, Research Associate
Julie Lindholm, Research Associate

Site Field Test Coordinators

Robert D. Stanton, WACOP
Marilyn Young, Pinal
Stephen McKibben, Tri-County
Bea Langley, Coconino
George O'Reilly, Coconino
Jerry O'Brien, Coconino
Jean E. VanWinkle, Yavapai
Sandra McCarthy, Roosevelt
Charles Small, Mesa
Jean Williamsen, Pima
Jim Harrison, Central Maricopa

Northern Arizona State University
Dr. Sam W. Bliss, Director
Educational Resources Management Center
Data Reduction

PREFACE

This is one of a series of field test reports on Arizona developed Career Education Curriculum Units. This report presents unit specific field test material. Another report in this series contains information concerning overall field test rationale and compilation of results for all field tested units.

The work presented and reported herein was performed pursuant to contract from the Arizona State Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Arizona State Department of Education and no official endorsement by the Arizona State Department of Education should be inferred.

INTRODUCTION

The major purpose of most innovative programs such as career education is to affect positively learners' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behavior according to expressed performance and behavioral objectives. The present field test of career education curriculum units is designed to examine the success of the unit in terms of the above. Cognitive and attitudinal data have been collected from sites and projects across the state of Arizona. The following projects were involved in the effort of field testing the units: Central Maricopa, Coconino, Mesa, Pima, Pinal, Roosevelt, Tri-County, WACOP, and Yavapai.

Data on the present unit, however, have been collected from the following sites:

Project	Classrooms Requested	Classrooms Used In Analysis*
Central Maricopa	3	3
Mesa	1	1
Pima	6	2
Tri-County	3	3
WACOP	5	5
Total	18	14

*Data received in time for analysis.

Significant statistics are presented and discussed in the Field Test Results section of this report. Other statistics and tabular data are presented in Appendix I of this report.

UNIT DESCRIPTION

YEARNINGS AND EARNINGS

Grade 4: Yearnings and Earnings

The primary purpose of this unit is to help the learners analyze the domestic situation of a home in terms of what is available, what is needed, and how all these are provided for within the community. Emphasis is placed on the learner's understanding of planned and unplanned expenses and the need for budgeting money to meet the expense of a home.

FIELD TEST RESULTS

YEARNINGS AND EARNINGS

This section of the report presents the data summary and analysis for the field test of the curriculum unit. An outline of this section follows:

A. A description of the field test including demographic characteristics of both participating teachers and learners.

B. Attitudinal data from both teachers and learners concerning the unit.

C. Learner performance data on the lesson specific items.

D. Teacher refinement data, analysis and comments.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF LEARNERS EXPOSED BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	SEX		ETHNIC COMPOSITION					
PROJECT	MALE	FEMALE	AMERICAN INDIAN	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME	ANGLO WHITE	OTHER	TOTAL NUMBER
Central Maricopa	88	86	0	6	18	150	0	174
Mesa	14	16	0	1	2	27	0	30
Pima	28	31	0	8	13	38	0	59
Tri-County	43	38	2	0	28	50	0	80
WACOP	75	64	1	1	38	98	1	139
Total	247	235	3	16	99	363	1	482
Percent	51	49	0.6	3	20	75	0.2	

TABLE II

NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	SEX		YEARS OF EXPERIENCE					CAREER EDUCATION EXPERIENCE				
PROJECT	MALE	FEMALE	LESS THAN 1	1-5	6-10	11-15	MORE THAN 15 YRS.	DEV'D. C. ED. UNIT OR PROGRAM	TAUGHT C. ED. UNIT OR PROGRAM	READ A C. ED. UNIT OR PROGRAM	FAMILIAR WITH CAREER ED.	HAD NO EXPOS. TO C. ED.
Central Maricopa	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	0
Mesa	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pima	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Tri-County	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
WACOP	1	4	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	0
Total	2	12	2	5	3	3	1	1	1	4	8	0

DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

The data in this report was obtained from the projects, teachers, and learners described in the following tables.

1. Learners

Table I presents demographic information on the learners that were exposed to the unit in the field test. Examining Table I, it can be seen that the male and female learners are fairly evenly represented. There was low representation by the minority groups. Out of 482 learners 25% (119) were from minority backgrounds 20% (99) Spanish Surname, 3% (16) Black, 0.6% (3) American Indian, and 0.2% (1) Other.

2. Teachers

Table II presents the total number and selected demographic characteristics of the teachers presenting the unit.

It can be noted from Table II that 12 of the 14 teachers that taught this unit were female.

The median years of experience for this group falls between 1-5 years. It should be noted that this group of teachers was moderately sophisticated concerning career education. All 14 teachers were familiar with

career education. However, only one had previously taught a career education unit or program and only one had actually developed a career education unit or program.

ATTITUDINAL DATA

1. Teacher Attitude

Included in each UNIVAL (Unit Evaluation Instrument) was an Instructor Attitudinal Data Sheet which asked two questions concerning attitudes toward career education in general and three questions concerning the teacher's attitude toward the unit (See Appendix II).

a. Teacher Attitude Toward Career Education

Examining the teachers' general attitude toward career education (Table III) it can be seen that the mean response across questions and projects is a very high 3.96, on a scale where 5 is the highest positive response. Of the 28 possible responses, 25 (89%) are positive toward career education, 1 (4%) is of no opinion, and only 2 (7%) negative.

b. Teacher Attitude Toward the Unit

Table IV summarizes the teacher attitudes toward the unit.

The teachers' high positive attitude toward career education carried over somewhat to the teachers' attitude

TABLE III

TEACHER ATTITUDE TOWARD CAREER EDUCATION
(Number, Percent and Mean of Instructor Responses to Attitude Items 1 and 2 Combined)

PROJECT	STRONGLY POSITIVE N	%	POSITIVE N	%	NO OPINION N	%	NEGATIVE N	%	STRONGLY NEGATIVE N	%	MEAN
Central Maricopa	0	0	6	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.00
Mesa	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.50
Pima	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.50
Tri-County	0	0	4	67	1	17	1	17	0	0	3.50
WACOP	1	10	8	80	0	0	1	10	0	0	3.90
Total	4	14	21	75	1	4	2	7	0	0	3.96

toward the unit. The teachers show a high 3.62 positive attitude toward the unit. Of the possible 42 responses, 28 (66%) are positive, 8 (19%) are of no opinion, and 6 (14%) negative.

Correlations between the Teacher Attitude toward career education and Teacher Attitude toward the unit were not significant (Appendix I).

2. Learner Attitude

When learner attitude toward the unit is examined (Table V), we see a moderately high positive feeling toward the unit across all projects. Of the 2749 responses 66% were positive toward the unit, 27% no opinion, and only 7% were negative toward the unit.

Correlations between the teacher attitude toward the unit and learner attitude were not significant (Appendix I).

LEARNER PERFORMANCE

In order to examine learners' performance on the unit, and to assess how well the objectives of the unit are met, cumulative scores over all the lesson items within the unit (total learner scores) were examined. Table VI presents the total learner scores in percentages by projects. This score reflects the unit's overall success concerning delivery of

TABLE IV

TEACHER ATTITUDE TOWARD UNIT
(Number, Percent and Mean of Instructor Responses
To Attitude Items 3, 4 and 5 Combined)

PROJECT	STRONGLY POSITIVE N	%	POSITIVE N	%	NO OPINION N	%	NEGATIVE N	%	STRONGLY NEGATIVE N	%	MEAN
Central Maricopa	2	22	5	56	2	22	0	0	0	0	4.00
Mesa	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.67
Pima	1	17	2	33	2	33	1	17	0	0	3.50
Tri-County	1	11	4	44	2	22	1	11	1	11	3.33
WACOP	0	0	10	67	2	13	2	13	1	7	3.40
Total	6	14	22	52	8	19	4	9	2	5	3.62

TABLE V

LEARNER ATTITUDE TOWARDS UNIT
(NUMBER, PERCENT AND MEAN OR COMPOSITE
LEARNER ATTITUDE RESPONSES)

	YES/HAPPY		I DON'T CARE/OK		NO/SAD		
PROJECT	N	%	N	%	N	%	MEAN
Central Maricopa	748	65	337	29	73	6	2.58
Mesa	52	36	56	39	36	25	2.11
Pima	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tri-County	448	80	80	15	29	5	2.75
WACOP	571	64	273	30	54	6	2.58
Total	1811	66	746	27	192	7	2.59

TABLE VI

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CORRECT LEARNER RESPONSES TO LESSON IMBEDDED ITEMS FOR A GIVEN UNIT

PROJECT	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	NUMBER OF CORRECT RESPONSES	PERCENT OF CORRECT RESPONSES
Central Maricopa	1015	873	86
Mesa	167	125	75
Pima	-	-	-
Tri-County	528	434	82
WACOP	883	757	86
Total	2593	2189	84

its objectives.

The scores from each project range from a low of 75% at Mesa to a high of 86% at Central Maricopa and WACOP. These responses appear uniform with no one project varying far from the mean score (84%) thereby exerting a disproportionate influence.

Various other data was collected from the teachers involved in the field test of the units.

The data collected included the following information:

1. Teachers indicated whether they had experience in jobs other than teaching and whether this information helps in teaching the unit. It was found that 8 of the 14 teachers (57%) had previous experience in a job other than teaching. Seven of these felt that the experience helped in teaching the unit. (Tables VII and VIII)
2. The teachers were asked how many guest speakers they used. Five of the 14 teachers (36%) did not use guest speakers. A total of 9 guest speakers were used in the 21 classrooms. (Table IX)
3. The teachers were also asked to indicate the amount of time devoted to the unit per week and what time of day (AM or PM) the unit was primarily taught. The median number of hours spent per week teaching the unit fell between 1-2 hours. Thirteen (93%) teachers taught the unit in the afternoon while only 1 (7%) taught the unit in the morning. (Table X and XI)

TABLE VII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF INSTRUCTORS THAT TAUGHT EACH UNIT BY OCCUPATION OTHER THAN TEACHING

PROJECT	SOCIAL SCIENCE		PHYSICAL SCIENCES		CHEMICAL SCIENCES		BUSINESS		TECHNI-CAL		CONSTRUC-TION		INDUSTRY		OTHER		NONE		TOTAL NO.
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Central Maricopa	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	0	0	3
Mesa	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pima	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
Tri-County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3
WACOP	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	5
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	43	14

TABLE VIII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF INSTRUCTORS THAT TAUGHT EACH UNIT BY WHETHER PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE HELPS IN CAREER EDUCATION

PROJECT	YES N	YES %	NO N	NO %	NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE N	NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE %	TOTAL NUMBER
Central Maricopa	3	100	0	0	0	0	3
Mesa	0	0	1	100	0	0	1
Pima	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
Tri-County	0	0	0	0	3	100	3
WACOP	4	80	0	0	1	20	5
Total	7	50	1	7	6	43	14

TABLE IX

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF INSTRUCTORS THAT TAUGHT EACH UNIT BY THE NUMBER OF GUEST SPEAKERS USED

	0		1		2		3		4		
PROJECT	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL NUMBER
Central Maricopa	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Mesa	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pima	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Tri-County	1	33	2	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
WACOP	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total	5	36	9	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

TABLE X

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF INSTRUCTORS THAT TAUGHT EACH UNIT
BY AMOUNT OF TIME DEVOTED TO THE UNIT EACH WEEK

PROJECT	LESS THAN 1 HR. N	%	1-2 HRS. N	%	2-3 HRS. N	%	3-5 HRS. N	%	MORE THAN 5 HRS. N	%	TOTAL NUMBER
Central Maricopa	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	0	0	3
Mesa	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1
Pima	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Tri-County	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	0	0	3
WACOP	0	0	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0	5
Total	3	21	4	29	6	43	1	7	0	0	14

TABLE XI

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF INSTRUCTORS THAT TAUGHT EACH UNIT BY TIME TAUGHT

PROJECT	AM N	AM %	PM N	PM %	TOTAL NUMBER
Central Maricopa	0	0	3	100	3
Mesa	0	0	1	100	1
Pima	0	0	2	100	2
Tri-County	1	33	2	67	3
WACOP	0	0	5	100	5
Total	1	7	13	93	14

TABLE XII

NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS THAT TAUGHT EACH UNIT
BY TYPE OF CLASSROOM AND METHOD OF TEACHING

PROJECT	OPEN CLASSROOM N	%	SELF CONTAINED N	%	TEAM TAUGHT N	%
Central Maricopa	0	0	1	33	2	67
Mesa	1	100	0	0	0	0
Pima	0	0	2	100	0	0
Tri-County	0	0	3	100	0	0
WACOP	1	20	4	80	0	0
Total	2	14	10	71	2	14

4. The teachers were also asked what kind of classroom or method of teaching they used. Ten (71%) of the classrooms were self-contained, 2 (14%) were open classroom and 2 (14%) were team taught. Table XII)

Correlations were calculated between the above data and Student Attitude, Teacher Attitude and Student Performance. No significant correlations were found.

TEACHER REFINEMENT, ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS

Specific revision data was obtained by asking the field test teachers to make comments regarding each lesson taught. These comments were solicited in the UNIVAL.

The following list represents a composite of teacher comments regarding the various aspects of the unit, as well as a lesson by lesson critique of the unit. These comments have been analyzed and recommendations for revision presented.

TEACHER COMMENTS

When reading the teacher comments it should be noted that not all teachers respond to the open ended items. Therefore, some of the responses seem inconsistent with the teacher responses to the closed items. The closed items, it is felt,

reflect a true attitude toward the unit over the teachers sampled. The teacher comments are from selected teachers that felt strongly enough to take the opportunity to respond. The comments are, therefore, more for curriculum refinement than for overall evaluation of the unit.

Central Maricopa

Maps - poorly done.

Pima

Well made and easy to teach. Students were very involved and participated freely. Little interest expressed by students. Unit too long and difficult. Too narrow in scope. Lesson suggested 90 minutes, we took 9 months.

Tri-County

Really liked the unit. Well written especially learning activities. Only brightest children made application to own lives. Assessment items for lesson 5 too difficult.

WACOP

Would like taped interviews because people don't want to talk to such young students. Too advanced for 4th grade. The objectives and expectations are beyond their scope and comprehension. The subject matter and presentation is boring and lacks excitement and color. Format and objectives are easily followed. Excellent unit. Unit ties in great with social studies curriculum.

SUMMARY

The relevant data collected during the field test is summarized below:

1. A total of 573 learners were exposed to this unit in 5 of the 9 participating projects. Fifty-one percent of the learners were male and 25% representatives of minority backgrounds.
2. Of the 14 teachers that presented the unit twelve were female, the median years of experience was between 1-5 years, and only 2 had taught or developed career education material.
3. Teachers expressed a very positive attitude toward career education in general (3.96 on a scale where 5 was the highest positive response). Though still positive, the teachers' attitude toward this particular unit was lower (3.62).
4. The learners also exhibited a positive attitude toward the unit with 66% of the 2749 responses positive, 27% no opinion, and only 7% negative.
5. The learners' overall performance was high (84% correct). There was very little variability across lessons and units.
6. A list of the teachers critical comments and recommendations was presented in the body of this report.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Future users of this unit should review the unit in its entirety paying particular attention to the content of each activity noting when during their teaching year it is best to be taught.
2. During installation the teachers, while not constrained by field testing, should be made aware that the lessons as presented are only suggestions and may be modified, resequenced, augmented or reduced as desired.
3. This unit presents a wide range of activity suggestions, many of which may be extracted to constitute an enrichment program in addition to the unit.
4. This unit was well received by both students and teachers. It is recommended that this unit be included in the implementation phase of curriculum development.

APPENDIX I

Additional Data

Mean Instructor Attitude Toward the Unit by Instructor Attitude Toward Career Education

Project	Teacher #	Instructor Unit Attitude (ques. 3-5)	Instructor Attitude Career Ed. (ques. 1,2)
Central Maricopa	1	3.67	4.00
	2	4.67	4.00
	3	3.67	4.00
Mesa	1	4.67	4.50
Pima	1	3.33	5.00
	2	3.67	4.00
Tri-County	1	3.67	3.00
	2	3.33	4.00
	3	3.00	3.50
WACOP	1	3.00	4.00
	2	2.67	3.00
	3	3.67	4.00
	4	4.00	4.00
	5	4.00	4.50

$r = 0.41$

Mean Student Attitude by Time of Day Unit Taught

Project	Teacher #	Attitude	Time of Day 1=pm 2=am
Central Maricopa	1	2.57	1
	2	2.64	1
	3	2.57	1
Mesa	1	2.11	1
Pima	1	-	1
	2	-	1
Tri-County	1	2.94	1
	2	2.54	2
	3	2.73	1
WACOP	1	2.42	1
	2	2.29	1
	3	2.81	1
	4	2.52	1
	5	2.75	1

$r = -0.05$

Mean Instructor Attitude Toward the Unit by Mean Learner Attitude

Project	Teacher #	Instructor Unit Attitude	Learner Attitude
Central Maricopa	1	3.67	2.57
	2	4.67	2.64
	3	3.67	2.57
Mesa	1	4.67	2.11
Pima	1	3.33	-
	2	3.67	-
Tri-County	1	3.67	2.94
	2	3.33	2.54
	3	3.00	2.73
WACOP	1	3.00	2.42
	2	2.67	2.29
	3	3.67	2.81
	4	4.00	2.52
	5	4.00	2.75

$r = 0.04$

Mean Learners Performance on a Unit by Mean Instructor Attitude Toward Unit

Project	Teacher #	*Learner Performance	Instructor Unit Attitude
Central Maricopa	1	91	3.67
	2	70	4.67
	3	91	3.67
Mesa	1	75	4.67
Pima	1	-	3.33
	2	-	3.67
Tri-County	1	91	3.67
	2	66	3.33
	3	87	3.00
WACOP	1	85	3.00
	2	98	2.67
	3	91	3.67
	4	84	4.00
	5	71	4.00

$r = -0.54$

*Percent of students attaining unit objectives

Mean Student Performance by Time of Day Unit Taught

Project	Teacher #	*Learner Performance	Time of Day 1=pm 2=am
Central Maricopa	1	91	1
	2	70	1
	3	91	1
Mesa	1	75	1
Pima	1	-	1
	2	-	1
Tri-County	1	91	1
	2	66	2
	3	87	1
WACOP	1	85	1
	2	98	1
	3	91	1
	4	84	1
	5	71	1

$r = -0.53$

*Percent of students attaining unit objectives



Unit Evaluation
UNIVAL

YEARNINGS AND EARNINGS

GRADE LEVEL: 4

PART I

CAREER EDUCATION FIELD TEST
PROGRAM INFORMATION

Please print:

Instructor_____ School_____

Unit or Kit Title_____ District_____

Grade Level_____ Project_____

Date unit or Kit introduced in the classroom____/____/____
mo. day year

Student data: (*the numbers should agree)

*Total number of students exposed to the unit_____

*Number of students of each sex: a. male____ b. female____

*Number of students in each ethnic group:

a. American Indian____ d. Anglo White____

b. Black____ e. Other____

c. Spanish Surname____

DIRECTIONS: Circle the letter of your answer in each of the following questions.

Teachers:

How many years have you worked in the field of education?

a. Less than one d. 11-15 years

b. 1-5 years e. More than 15 years

c. 6-10 years

Which of the following would best describe your exposure to Career Education (to date)? I have:

a. Developed a Career Education unit or program

b. Taught a Career Education unit or program

c. Read a Career Education unit or program

d. Had some exposure to Career Education

e. Had no exposure to Career Education

What is your sex?

a. Male____

b. Female____

Is your classroom: (more than one answer may be applicable)

a. Open____

b. Self-contained____

c. Team taught

What time of day were the lessons taught (predominantly)?

a. AM____

b. PM____

How much time did you devote to the unit each week?

a. Less than 1 hour

b. 1-2 hours

c. 2-3 hours

d. 3-5 hours

e. More than 5 hours

How many guest speakers were used in conjunction with the unit?

a. 0

b. 1

c. 2

d. 3

e. 4 or more

Have you had another occupation other than teaching?

a. Social sciences

b. Physical sciences

c. Chemical sciences

d. Business

e. Technical

f. Construction

g. Industry

h. _____

Did this experience help in teaching the Career Education unit?

a. Yes

b. No

PART II

Learner Performance Data

Directions: Please provide an indication of how well the lessons delivered the performance objectives. The lesson numbers and methods of evaluation for each have been indicated. Page numbers, objective specifications, and item numbers are indicated as appropriate. Please indicate the total number of learners responding. Then record the number that responded correctly. Complete this form as you teach each lesson of the unit.

		Method of Evaluation			Number of Learners	
Lesson Number	Page No. Item No.	Test	Checklist	Instructor Judgment	Responding	Responding Correctly
						Minimum of 3 correct
1	p. 16					
						Minimum of 5 correct
2	p. 21					
						Minimum of 3 correct
3	p. 32					
						Minimum of 4 correct
4	p. 37					
						Minimum of 1 correct
5	p. 55					
						Minimum of 3 correct
6	(#1) p. 69					
						Minimum of 2 correct
6	(#2) p. 69					

Yearnings and Earnings
Garde Level 4

PART III

Instructor Attitudinal Data

Directions: Read each statement and place a check in the box under the heading that describes your response.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Classes in my subject grade level would be more meaningful and relevant if focused around Career Education objectives.					
2.	Career Education is just another fad that will soon be forgotten.					
3.	After minimal revisions this unit will be ready for statewide distribution.					
4.	The learning activities were very effective in helping meet the performance stated.					
5.	The content of the unit relates directly to my regular class program.					

Indicate below any further comments concerning the strengths or weaknesses of the unit.

PART III (Continued)

Learner Attitudinal Data

On the following page is an attitudinal survey which we would like your learners to respond to. Please remove that page from this instrument and reproduce enough copies for each of your learners. We feel that it would be best if your learners responded to this survey at the completion of the unit. If your learners do not have the needed reading ability to complete the survey, please read and explain the items to them. After the learners have completed the survey, please tally their responses and record the total number of learners responding in each manner of the form provided below.

	YES	I DON'T CARE	NO
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

	HAPPY	OK	SAD
5.			
6.			
7.			

PART III (cont'd)

LEARNER ATTITUDINAL FORM

NAME _____

1. Would you want to know more about what we have learned in these lessons?

YES I DON'T CARE NO

2. Do you know more now about these lessons than before?

3. Were the lessons interesting to you?

4. Do you think that next year's class should be given these lessons?

5. How did you feel about the lessons?

HAPPY OK D

6. How did most of your other classmates feel about the lessons?

7. How did your teacher feel about the lessons?

13